

VANCOUVER

<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Street</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Postal Code</u>
Vernon Bellcourt	American Indian Movement			
Mrs. Agnis Lamonte				
Louis Badwound				
Edgar Bearunner				
Rev. Ted Eden	Anglican Church	4755 Arthur Drive	Delta, B.C.	
Rev. Peter Davison				
Mrs. Jeanette Steiger				
Peter Chapman				
Mr. John W. Stokes	Anglican Church of Canada	4812 Scott Avenue,	Terrace, B.C.	V8G 2B4
Rev. Jack Shaver	B.C. Conference of United Church of Canada	505 Dunsmuir St.	Vancouver, B.C.	V6V 1Y5
Rev. Arthur M. Anderson				
Peter Chataway	B. C. Environmental Council	8234 Montcalm St.	Vancouver, B.C.	
Len Guy	B.C. Federation of Labour	210-517 E. Broadway	Vancouver, B.C.	
Ron Johnston				
Rev. Wes Maultsaid	B.C. Inter-Church Committee for World Education Dev.	150 Robson St.	Vancouver, B.C.	V6B 2A7
Miss Dorothy Morrison	B.C. Peace Council	712-207 Hastings St.	Vancouver, B.C.	V6B 1H7
Lorne Chark	Churchill Secondary School		Vancouver, B.C.	
Mr. Harry Rankin	City of Vancouver		Vancouver, B.C.	
Harry Antonides	Committee for Liberty and Justice Foundation		Vancouver, B.C.	

VANCOUVER

<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Street</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Postal Code</u>
Daniel O'Brien ✓	Co-operative Christian Campus Ministry	5885 University Blvd.	Vancouver, B.C.	
Couglas Dobyns ✓	Creative Survival	1070 Llanfair Cres.	Brentwood Bay B.C.	
Harry Crosby ✓		4296 W 8th	Vancouver, B.C.	
Jill Wight ✓	Crossroads International	549 W 14	Vancouver, B.C.	
Ms. B.G. MacDougall ✓	CUSO - Univ. of B.C.	2146 East 19th Ave.	Vancouver, B.C.	V5N 2J4
Mike Sakamoto ✓	Vanc. Metro Committee, CUSO	2524 Cypress	Vancouver, B.C.	
John Daly			Pender Harbour, B.C.	
Bruce G. Eriksen ✓	Downtown Eastside Residents' Association	616 East Cordova	Vancouver, B.C.	V6A 1L9
Linda Hurst ✓	Downtown East Side Women's Centre	412 E. Hastings St.	Vancouver, B.C.	
K.G. Farquharson ✓		401-1111 W Georgia St	Vancouver, B.C.	V6E 3G7
Michael Ferretta ✓			Deroche, B.C.	
Richard Stace-Smith ✓	Federation of B.C. Naturalists	4264 West 13 Ave.	Vancouver, B.C.	
Rev. James Manly ✓	First United Church	Box 124,	Iadysmith, B.C.	
Vicki Obedkoff ✓	First United Church	320 Hastings St.	Vancouver, B.C.	V6A 1P4
Bill Hennessey ✓				



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761120620224>

VANCOUVER

<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Street</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Postal Code</u>
Mrs. Beatrice Geddes ✓ Bernard & Mavis Gillie ✓		4217 Granville, RR#3	Vancouver, B.C. Victoria, B.C.	
Rev. Sister Giovanna ✓		8069 - 17th Ave.	Burnaby, B.C.	
Gary Gallon ✓ Paul Spong ✓	SPEC Greenpeace Foundation	c/o 2007 W.-4th Ave.	Vancouver, B.C.	V6J 1N3
Dick Hodgkinson ✓		Box 101	Mount Curie, B.C.	
Bishop R.J. Deroo ✓	Human Rights Comm. of B.C.		Victoria, B.C.	
Mrs. Rose Charlie	Indian Homemakers Association of B.C.			
Joe Tanenbaum ✓	International Development Education Resource Assoc.	2524 Cypress Street	Vancouver, B.C.	
Mr. John Lambert Sister Joan McCall			Vancouver, B.C. Vancouver, B.C.	
Helga Sturm Sylvia Meyer	Media and Society Class Capilano College	652 E. Kings Road	N. Vancouver, B.C.	
Gilbert Cook ✓ Steve Carpenter ✓ Lonnie Hindle ✓	Native Brotherhood of B.C.	517-193 E. Hastings	Vancouver, B.C.	V6A 1N7
Miss Celia Koval ✓	Native Law Student Assoc.	University of B.C.	Vancouver, B.C.	
Mr. Jack Moul ✓	Pacific Western Airlines	International Airport	Vancouver, B.C.	

VANCOUVER

<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Street</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Postal Code</u>
Art Pape ✓		2659 Trinity St.	Vancouver, B.C.	
Mike Lewis ✓				
Randall Potts ✓		3940 West 10th Ave.	Vancouver, B.C.	
Rodney Paine ✓	Sam Guthrie Club, N.D.P.	Box 124	Ladysmith, B.C.	
Terry Simmons ✓		P.O. Box 1166, Sta. A	Vancouver, B.C.	
Sister Margaret Sadler ✓	Sisters of the Child Jesus	524 West 6th St.	Vancouver, B.C.	
Mr. John F. Greene ✓	St. Joseph's Parish	Box #719	Chemainus, B.C.	V0R 1K0
John Symon			Nanaimo, B.C.	
Anna Hagen ✓	Tamahnous Theatre Workshop	2665 Maple St.	Vancouver, B.C.	V6J 3T7
Walt Taylor		RR#1, Garnett Valley Road	Summerland, B.C.	V0H 1Z0
George Watts ✓	Tcheshaht Band	Box 1216	Port Alberni, B.C.	
Chief Philip Paul ✓	Tsartlip Band	Box 250	Brentwood Bay, B.C.	
Bill Wilson ✓	Union of B.C. Indian Chiefs	261-3355 W. Broadway	Vancouver, B.C.	V6R 2B1
Len Berry ✓	United Nations Assoc. in Can.	2524 Cypress St.	Vancouver, B.C.	V6J 3N2
Alex E. Scoten ✓	Vancouver Board of Trade	500-1177 W. Hastings	Vancouver, B.C.	V6E 2K3
Clive Stockdale				
Tony Pearse ✓	Voice		Terrace, B.C.	

VANCOUVER

<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Street</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Postal Code</u>
Lille d'Easum	Voice of Women	104-2127 W. 40th Ave.	Vancouver, B.C.	V6M 1W4
Alan Moyes	West Coast Environmental Law Association	1012-207 W. Hastings	Vancouver, B.C.	V6B 1H7
Peter B. Holmes	Whitepass & Yukon Corp. Ltd.	Box 10140, Pacific Centre, 701 West Georgia St.	Vancouver, B.C.	V7Y 1E6

MONDAY MAY 10, 1976

8:00 P.M.

1. REV. WES MAULTSAID
Education Officer, Inter-Church Committee
for World Education Development
2. BISHOP REMI DEROO
3. GARY GALLON and DR PAUL SPONG
Society for Pollution and Environmental Control
4. DOUG VINCENT
Board of Trade
5. HARRY RANKIN
Alderman
6. LEN GUY
B.C. Federation of Labour
7. BILL WILSON, Exec Comm Member
Union of B.C. Indian Chiefs
(B.C. Association of Non-Status Indians)
8. K.G. FARQUHARSON, P.Eng.
9. ARTHUR PAPE and MICHAEL LEWIS

TUESDAY, MAY 11, 1976

10:00 A.M.

10. JOHNNY CLIFTON
President Native Brotherhood of B.C.
11. BEV CURRIE
Lutheran Campus Centre

TUESDAY MAY 11, 1976 - 10:00 A.M. continued

12. PETER B. HOLMES
White Pass & Yukon Corp. Ltd.
13. BERNARD & MAVIS GILLIE
14. DOUGLAS DOBYNS
Creative Survival
15. ART ANDERSON
Rev. Shaver *Conference*
B.C. Confederation of United Church of Canada
16. ~~DR. ECHO LIDSTER~~
17. RICHARD STACE-SMITH
Federation of B.C. Naturalists
18. CHIEF PHILIP POWELL
Tsartlip Band Brentwood Bay, B.C.
-

TUESDAY MAY 11, 1976

2:00 P.M.

19. CELIA KOVAL
REP. FOR THE Native Law Student Association of U.B.C.
20. HARRY BURROW
CONCERNED CITIZENS' Group from Christian Churches
in Chemainus
21. WEST COAST ENVIRONMENTAL LAW ASSOCIATION
22. MS. LILLE D'EASUM
Voice of Women
23. BEATRICE LIDDIS

TUESDAY MAY 11, 1976 2:00 p.m. continued

24. BILL HENESSEY
First United Church
25. TERRY SIMMONS
26. VICKI OBEDKOFF
First United Church
27. BRIAN LOOMES
International Development Education Resource
Assoc.
28. HARRY ANTONIDES
C.J.L. Foundation
29. LORNE CLARK
Churchill Secondary
-

TUESDAY MAY 11, 1976

2:00 P.M.

30. BEV McDOUGALL
C U S O - U.B.C.
31. DICK HODGEKINSON
32. ALISON INGLIS
33. JIM MANLEY
Ladysmith United Church - also appearing for the
Sam Guthrie Club
34. JOHN BUCKING
B.C. Peace Council
35. HELGA STURM
CAPILANO COLLEGE Media Class
36. RANDALL POTTS
37. SOUTH AFRICAN COALITION

TUESDAY MAY 11, 1976 8:00 PM continued

38. C U S O

Metro Vancouver

39. TAMAHNOUS THEATRE WORKSHOP

40. OUTREACH SCHOOL

41. REV. SISTER GIOVANNA

WEDNESDAY, MAY 12, 1976

10:00 A.M.

42. JACK MOUL

P.W.A.

43. EVE SMITH

44. S.C.W. STOKES

45. WALT TAYLOR

46. MR. JOHN W. STOKES, LIASON OFFICER, for Northwest Development
Anglican Church of Canada

47. NORMA JEAN McCALLUM
Downtown East Side Womens' Centre

48. HARRY KOHNE

49. BRUCE G. ERIKSEN, President
Downtown Eastside Residents Association

50. HARRY CROSBIE

51. JILL WHITE
Canadian Cross Roads International

WEDNESDAY MAY 12, 1976 10:00 A .M continued

52. FRANK L. BIEBE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 12, 1976

2:00 P.M.

53. TED EDEN

Anglican Church Comm. on Social Responsibility

54. GEORGE WATTS

TCHESHAHT BAND

55. MRS. E. HAGELL

56. SISTER MARGARET SADLER

57. B.C. ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL

58. ELAINE JONES

Co-operative Christian Campus Ministry

59. U N ASSOCIATION

Vancouver Branch

MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE INQUIRY

RANCH OFFICE:

Empire Building
124 O'Connor Street, #502
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5M9

Telephone: (613) 235-6159
Telex: 053-3693

COMMISSIONER

Mr. Justice Thomas R. Berger

HEADQUARTERS:

Resources Building
5009-51st Street,
P.O. Box 2817
Yellowknife, N.W.T. X0E 1H0

Telephone: (403) 873-3580
Telex: 034-45552

OPENING REMARKS

BY THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE T. R. BERGER

AT THE HEARING OF THE

MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE INQUIRY

VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA

MONDAY, MAY 10TH, 1976

8:00 P.M.

We in Canada stand at our last frontier. We have some important decisions to make, decisions for which all of us will share a measure of responsibility.

Two pipeline companies, Arctic Gas and Foothills Pipe Lines, are competing for the right to build a gas pipeline to bring natural gas from the Arctic Ocean to southern Canada and the United States. The Government of Canada has established this Inquiry to see what the social, economic and environmental consequences will be if the pipeline goes ahead, and to recommend what terms and conditions should be imposed if the pipeline is built.

We are conducting an Inquiry about a proposal to build a pipeline along the route of Canada's mightiest river; a pipeline costlier than any in history; a pipeline to be built across our Northern Territories, across a land where four races of people (white, Indian, Metis and Inuit) live, where seven different languages are spoken; the first pipeline in the world to be buried in the permafrost.

The pipeline project will not simply consist of a right of way. It will take three years to build. It will entail hundreds of miles of access roads over the snow and ice, it will mean that 6,000 workers will be needed to build the pipeline, and 1200 more to build the gas plants in the Mackenzie Delta; it will mean pipe, barges, wharves,

trucks, machinery, aircraft, airstrips; in addition, it will mean enhanced oil and gas exploration and development in the Mackenzie Valley, the Mackenzie Delta and the Beaufort Sea.

So we must consider the impact of an energy corridor that will bring gas and oil from the Arctic to the mid-continent.

It will be for the Government of Canada, when they have my report and the report of the National Energy Board, to decide whether the pipeline should be built and the energy corridor established. These are questions of national policy to be determined by those elected to govern.

My task, and the task of this Inquiry, is to make sure that we understand the consequences of what we are doing, to enable the Government to make an informed judgment.

The Inquiry began its hearings on March 3, 1975 in Yellowknife. Since then we have held many months of formal hearings listening to the evidence of engineers, scientists, biologists, anthropologists, economists, listening to the people who have made it the work of their lifetime to study the North and Northern conditions.

The environment of the Arctic has been called fragile. That may or may not be true. Arctic species certainly are tough. They have to be to survive, but at certain times of the year, especially when they are having their young, they are vulnerable.

Chief Phillip Paul - Brentwood Bay, B.C.

- conservation above consumption
- and survival above extinction
- don't build pipeline (period)

John Daly - fisherman Pender Harbor, B.C.

3 tcf in MD sounds like a lot in the MD but not enough to justify a pipeline

Littledale
7-8 tcf now + those enough to justify a pipeline

Pimlott
- CARC wants to BI to ^{increase understanding} ~~blow~~ of offshore drilling generally so we can know more about it for application elsewhere.

If you build a pipeline from Alaska along the Arctic coast of the Yukon you will be opening up a wilderness where the Porcupine Caribou herd calves - on the coastal plain and in the foothills - every summer. Then it is proposed that the pipeline from Alaska should cross the mouth of the Mackenzie Delta, where the white whales of the Beaufort Sea have their young each year. Millions of birds come to the Mackenzie Delta and the coast of the Beaufort Sea each summer from all over the Western Hemisphere to breed and to store up energy for their long journey south in the fall. Can we build pipelines from the North under conditions that will ensure the survival of these species? These are some of the questions that we are examining.

But it is the people of the North that have the most at stake here, because they will have to live with whatever decisions are made.

That is why the Inquiry has held hearings in 28 cities and towns, villages, settlements and outposts in the North, to enable the peoples of the North to tell me, the government and all of us what their life and their own experience have taught them about the North, and the likely impact of a pipeline and energy corridor.

The Inquiry has been from Sachs Harbour to Fort Smith, from Old Crow to Fort Franklin, and has heard from 700 witnesses in English, French, Loucheux, Slavey, Dogrib, Chipewyan and Eskimo.

Tues.

- ① Johnny Chifton - Native Brotherhood of BC
 - settlement (not extinguishment) must precede pipeline
- ② O'Brien - Coop Christian Campus Ministry at UBC
 - claims before pipeline
 - can't support consumptive society
 - "destroy the lifestyle of one group for the benefit of another"
 - allow us to continue living the good life (MVPL)
 - 10 yr moratorium time to assess our needs and energy alternatives
 - at very min, settlement before MVPL
- ③ Holmes of White Pass + Yukon
 - dev. of AG pl. essential to eco wellbeing of northern firms
 - diversification of Yukon economy
 - AG pl. built with due regard
- ④ Bernard + Mavis Gillie (from Victoria)
 - 10 yrs in north - he was in charge of educ. program of Mack District
 - dir. of educ. ~~the~~ until 1972 for all territories
 - govt + corp. people making decisions can't identify with northerners
 - present plans will bring eco. + social upheaval.
 - might is not right
 - decade for decision
 - ecology impacts
 - better indication of eco impact
 - settle claims
 - opportunity for older native people to understand
 - extraction not development would be primary role
 - labor practices in south used in north
 - educ. system of north needs time to serve its purpose
- ⑤ Douglas Dobyns of Creative Survival
- ⑥ BC Conference of United Church
 - postpone for claims
- ⑦ Grace-Smith of Fed. of BC Naturalists
 - we'll give natives our moral support
 - 3 TCF in MD/BS
 - wildlife impacts
 - conservation - project expenditure + keep energy demand within that
 - phase out exports of oil + gas
 - not naturally not in interest of large corps to preach conservation
- Bliger - from very eminent ornithol. consult. to AG.
 - Done - J of C approved D in '73
 - " " didn't ask me to express an opinion ~~but~~
 - " " has no right to express an opin + will not
 - J of C approval is to find if there is oil + gas in deep waters BS
 - if gas line built + oil line follows,
 - B says if gas, oil follows
 - that means proliferation into BS + that means a risk greater than 2 wells - we're looking at long term in Beaufort Sea

Our task is to establish constructive approaches to Northern development. If we are to do that we have an obligation to canvass all of the questions before us.

Some of these questions are: Should native land claims be settled before the pipeline is built? If it is built, and the native people want to participate in its construction, how can we ensure that they are given an opportunity to work on the pipeline? Can they develop skills on the pipeline that will be of some use to themselves and to the North after the pipeline is built? Can we provide a sound basis for Northern business to obtain contracts and subcontracts on the pipeline?

What about the unions? We are told they have an awesome measure of control over pipeline construction in Alaska. Should they have the same measure of control over pipeline construction in the Mackenzie Valley?

What about the local taxpayer in Yellowknife and Inuvik? If you have a pipeline boom, you will have to expand your schools, your hospitals, your police force, your local services. What measures ought to be taken to enable the municipalities and other institutions of local government to cope with the impact?

We Canadians think of ourselves as a Northern people. So the future of the North is a matter of concern to all of us. In fact it is our own appetite for oil and gas, and our own patterns of energy consumption that have given rise to proposals to bring oil and gas from the Arctic.

Paul Spanglin of Greenpeace

- whale studies
- MD/BS whales
- whale populat. small + in hidden seas i.e. BS
- islands built in beluga breeding grounds.
- if drilling continues + devel. goes forward, human invasion of whale territory create imbalance for reproduction, particularly white whale
- if dev. proceeds, at least clin. of white whale pop. + probably bowhead pop. in these waters

Harry Rankin ① no energy crisis in Cda -

② need nat. energy policy on Cda needs, not profits

③ no dev. before claims settled

- special treatment needed
- not extinguish claims
- no dev. without their agreement
- preferential treatment for northerners
- if N is developed as corps + govt want, N will be pillaged + destroyed.

BC Fed of Labor - "totally vs. MOPL"

- present or foreseeable future a callous + inhuman act vs. the people of the N

- ~~your report~~ your report will meet the needs of the Cda people + natives of the N.

Union of BC Indian Chiefs - we require dev. to expand to breed
(Bill Wilson)

- " " rt. to live in our own way
- how many jobs
- welfare + bigotry
- what does pipeline mean?
- survival = claims before pipeline
- = change attitudes + social values + minorities
- = that kind of a thing (a miracle)
- a cornerstone in ? of what kind of a country we are
(looking back 25 yrs from now, I hope)

Ken Farguason - problem is an ethical one

- could be technically built
- the Indian, Inuit + Metis will develop the north
- north will be strong only if people of the north are strong
- put pipeline aside until equality established

Pope + Lewis

Beyer - GJC gave the mandate to the Inquiry

- " " gave funding + others

- every participant considers Inq. a learning experience

It may well be that what happens in the North and to Northern peoples will tell us what kind of a people we are.

That is why we are here to listen to you.

Jan Scott - southern proceedings

- 3 sessions/day am pm + even.
- appts. allocated by session
- purpose of appts is not to close out others who have not responded to the ads - we still want to hear - write to Ing. or speak to Scott or Wadell at hearings
- not here be subject to cross-x
- at end of @ session, @ participant has 10 mins.

for Wes Malsedd - wealth + control of resources + colonialism + poverty + growth of economy + sustain 15% of rich - decisions already made on northern resources - BS exploration

- rep. ecumenical groups in 16 BC communities - we studied documents
 - full participation
 - land claims
 - native role in dev.
- March 2/76 - ? - colonial patterns of dev not prevail in North
 - just settlement
 - meet human needs + not objectives of trans-national corps
 - no approval until Berger
 - no rt. conveyed until agreement in principle on all nat. land claims in NW
 - Polar has not proceed until similar inquiry.
 - this Ing. his/step in struggle for justice.

- Bishop LeRue of Victoria - chairperson of BC Human Rts. Commission #1 issue rts. of natives = I want to question some of our energy assumptions - anti-ES&D HD ads on TV =
 - assumption #1 - northern dev. benefits every Cdn. - multi-nationals, southern affluent minority
 - are we entitled to them by trampling on natives
 - #2 - capital-intensive dev. in North restricts other areas of growth
 - prolong W + P controls which hurt minority most
 - #3 - MVPL urgently needed - the GNP + profit cults may prove mistaken
 - #4 - who determines what's best
 - the ethical today fast becoming the practical
 - native concerns just as NB as eco benefits.
 - we urge delay until BT ends + claims justly settled
 - don't give natives deadlines
 - ethical, cultural + political rts of people = NB

- Van Bd of Trade -

- SPEC wants to delay until - adeg. enviro studies oil + gas dev.
 - adeg. engin. + techn studies
 - energy policy → conservation
 - DIAND split
 - land claims settled
 - hope natives will not become the developers - royalties lose feeling of culture, environ., etc.
- oil spills 5 in BC - none of them cleaned up more than 10% of spill (slides)
- \$2/bbl. of oil price - we can't afford it
- must conserve rather than destroy ecosystem + culture of abn. H.

BRIEF SUBMITTED TO THE MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE INQUIRY

by the International Development Education
Resource Association

2524 Cypress Street
Vancouver, B.C.

April 21, 1976

We wish to take this opportunity to express our support for the land claims of the Dene and Inuit peoples. With all due respect to the members of this Inquiry, we are not under any illusion that the Canadian government is genuinely prepared to respect the rights of Native people. We think the decision about northern resource exploitation has been made. Statements by government ministers, the prospecting permits granted, the exploration taking place in the Beaufort Sea, the conflicts of interest surrounding the National Energy Board's decision on the pipeline and the authority of this Inquiry to report upon terms and conditions that ought to be imposed in respect of any right-of-ways granted for pipelines indicate that the basic decision has been made. The oil companies want to get at the oil and gas and the government is only too eager to oblige. A new "national dream" might bring in a few royalties, depending on how much we spend dredging out ports for the Dome Petroleum Company. And better yet, the dream might take people's minds off

inflation, unemployment and wage controls. At the same time, one has to make a show of democratic process.

We are not appealing to the government. We simply wish to make it clear that their plans are opposed. More importantly, we want to briefly explain to other Canadians why we oppose this so-called "development" and why we support land claims. We know that this support must grow and the government's attempts to play off southern Canadians against northern Natives must be defeated. This Inquiry has at least made many of us aware of the issue, much to the displeasure of the government, we are sure. That is why we take this opportunity here to state our support.

The native land settlement issue has come about as a result of the realization of the Dene and Inuit peoples that their survival is at stake--the survival of their nation and their spirit.

There is a major difference between the way the native people view their land and the way government bureaucracies and corporate structures view the north. The relationship the natives have to their land is an

emotional as well as a physical one. It is their source of food, their security and the essence of what they are as a nation. They know their land and how to use it with respect. They are experts in survival, having accumulated experience for thousands of years. They are willing to share their land. That is their spirit. But there is no price for their land. Their land is not for sale.

Now the southerners are coming to take out the resources from their land. The southerners, being the government and the corporations, see the land as matter of commodity exchange. Few, if any, will stay on as residents after the resources are depleted in a few years. It is the native peoples who will have to live with the devastation.

We support the Native peoples' claim for an equitable land settlement. This first step would at least assure the cultural survival of the Dene and Inuit peoples. They are the majority in their traditional land and must be allowed to negotiate the terms of participation in their country. To date, the major decisions about how the territories will be developed

...as well as a ...
...
...
...
...
...
...
...
...
...

...
...
...
...
...
...
...
...
...
...

...
...
...
...
...
...
...
...
...
...

have been made by and for the benefit of outsiders. Now, it is time for those who inhabit the area known as the Northwest Territories to have their say as to how their land should be used, and what schools and other institutions are needed to preserve and protect their culture from disappearing.

In our work, which consists of educational programs on the Third World and international issues, we have learned something about processes of development and the power peoples have or do not have over the course of their lives. Most of the Third World is a testament to the economic exploitation and political/ social oppression of peoples at the hands of imperialism. The continuing plunder of Africa, Asia and Latin America is common knowledge. But Canada's North is also like the Third World to those who seek maximum profits.

Native peoples were the foundation of the early accumulation of wealth in Canada through the fur trade. Now it is their land which must be opened up to multi-nationals, aided and abetted by the Canadian government.

For their part, the government and its agencies talk of the "national interest" and echo the companies'

cry of "energy crisis". It is peculiar that five years ago the minister of energy, mines and resources told us we had enough oil for 923 years and gas for 392 years. Three years later we are being told that we will be facing a shortage by 1982! How peculiar that when OPEC finally begins to get a decent price for its oil, a "crisis" occurs and we are told the North must be opened up. We agree that there is a crisis; not a crisis of energy, however, but of the entire capitalist system.

The victories of national liberation struggles and the growing unity of the Third World have put western imperialism on the defensive. In order to increase its profits it now has to get more at home. The same forces behind wage controls, the attack on Canadian workers, are the forces behind the attack on Native land in the North.

We support the land claims of the Dene and Inuit people, based on their aboriginal rights. There are only two choices: either genuine self-determination based on Native control of the land and its resources; or genocide--the destruction of

a people and its way of life.

From our studies of a country like China, we know that self-determination for nations within a nation (ie. China's autonomous regions) is possible when government policy does not follow the dictates of profit.

In Canada, profit determines policy. We know, therefore, that Natives must struggle to achieve self-determination. We support that struggle manifested in their land claims and we urge all working Canadians to recognize that we face a common enemy with Native people. Their struggle is ours.

✓
copy for Hollands please

BRIEF TO THE MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE INQUIRY

Presented by

The New Democratic Party

Stuart Leggatt, MP
New Westminster

Mr. Commissioner, my name is Stuart Leggatt. I am a Member of Parliament for the Federal Constituency of New Westminster, and I am here representing myself and my colleagues in the New Democratic Party in the Federal House of Commons.

We have taken time to review the terms of reference of the Commission, and while we would have liked to have seen the terms of reference expanded, somewhat beyond the question of reporting on the terms and conditions to be imposed in respect to the proposed new rights of way, we will try to keep our remarks within those terms of reference.

First of all, you've received a great deal of evidence which concerns the impact which the proposals of Canadian Arctic Gas Pipeline Ltd. and Foothills Pipeline Ltd. will have in terms of the deterioration of the native social order and its values, and in terms of the fears that the community legitimately has concerning their future, in the event that one of the proposals proceeds. We, therefore, firmly support the principle of an equitable settlement of native claims prior to the issuance of any permit for a pipeline, so that native people may have an opportunity to have some control over, and some benefit from, any development that may follow.

It is also our belief, on a review of the evidence, that the so-called beneficial impact of jobs for local people, comes only as a very short-term benefit, and may result in long-term deterioration of the way of life of people in the north. I might say that this position is firmly supported by our Member of

Parliament for the Northwest Territories, Wally Firth, who is travelling in his very extensive riding, is unable to be here, and wished me to express these views to you on his behalf.

You have also heard evidence concerning the environmental impact of development along the North Slope of the Yukon and Alaska, either along the coast or towards the interior skirting the Old Crow Flats. This is the weakest part of the environmental case put before you by Arctic Gas. A 48-inch pipeline and its attendant operation cannot pass through wildlife ranges of completely unspoiled nature, without serious and damaging effect. The fact that these lines would also pass across hundreds of traplines, streams and hunting areas, is also a clear disadvantage. The route would also proceed through several areas where rare and endangered species, such as the Peregrine Falcon have their habitat.

The impact on the Porcupine Cariboo herd and the thousands of birds that migrate from the coast to molt, nest and raise their young, would cause unacceptable and unpredictable impacts. This is particularly true since most of the routes you have before you would open complete wilderness and would open it irreversibly.

Even the post-construction activities from compressor station noise to operations and maintenance will add to the increasing clamour of progress in what was one of the last quiet and natural areas of our country. We believe, therefore, that the impact, both social and environmental, will be much greater than that predicted by much of the evidence so far presented. I have recently visited the MacKenzie Delta to observe development and its impact. Those working on rigs are flown directly to Edmonton to avoid the problems of contact with the native community. ✓
That is stark evidence of the potential for problems in the event of approval of either project. NO

I would now like to turn to the problem of northern development from a more southern perspective. One thing seems to me, certain.

We do have time. Delays in the issuance of permits for rights of way and delays in construction of any project gives us an opportunity not only to carefully consider alternative proposals for delivery of northern energy resources. It gives us time to canvass alternate energy sources themselves: coal gasification, wind, solar and tidal power, are all options that need further and fuller investigation.

Arctic Gas and its supporters argue that there is an imminent need for gas in the Canadian market, and they seem to have persuaded the National Energy Board to this position. I would suggest, however, that two factors, which undercut the case for haste in bringing gas to market, have not been sufficiently considered in their judgement. First, the projections of demand are based on a growth of GNP that is exaggerated by at least two to three percent, based upon our own research. There is no way that our economy will grow at the rate predicted, and consequently, the demand for natural gas will be lower than anticipated. Secondly, the projections of supply ignore the fact that the industry's prices for natural gas have spurred further southern exploration. The upshot is that our demand for natural gas should not require frontier gas, for roughly ten years after it has been projected.

The problem of any project is to get underway quickly to avoid competition. That, however, is surely a problem for the companies. It is not a consideration for the Canadian people and certainly not for the people of the north.

Other alternatives should also be canvassed. There is the possibility of polar gas, of off-shore gas on the east coast, and last, but not least, is the question of an Alcan route.

Finally, time gives to the residents of the south an opportunity to review their own energy appetites and consider the question of energy consumption. Professor Halliwell has made this argument more eloquently than I, on several occasions, and we support it. I would like to congratulate you Mr. Commissioner for, to some extent, giving those of us in the south an opportunity to look at the way we use energy - unfortunately all too wastefully.

Some time ago a Gallup Poll indicated a growing desire of the Canadian public for a fair and equitable settlement of native claims and support for a complete and thorough investigation of these applications. Sometimes I think the public is far ahead of the politicians on this subject. I think they are asking for some leadership in terms of the way we presently use and squander energy in this country.

But there is a point in this subject where a question of political reality does come in. That is the fait accompli of the Canada-U.S. treaty concerning pipelines. It does seem clear that Canada has provided a commitment to carry, at least, U.S. energy to the U.S. market. We would suggest that very serious consideration should be given to a solution that would allow us to satisfy a commitment made, that would not prejudice the social and environmental future of the north.

I refer, of course, to the growing popularity of the proposal of an Alcan route. This, of course, would envisage building a pipeline for Alaskan gas along the existing rights of way of Alyeska Oil Pipeline, and the Alaska highway. The impacts would be restricted to areas that have already been opened up and where the damage has already been done. This route is not without some environmental and social impact, but it does seem to us, well worth an intensive investigation by your Commission. Firstly, rights of way already exist where damage has been done and certainly, the environmental impact of a highway is higher than an oil or a gas pipeline. Secondly, such a route can justify any of the various sizes of pipeline that are being requested, and our advice is that such a route could run at the same cost as current proposals (because of the under-utilised laterals - Prudhoe Bay to the Delta). Thirdly, this route would have the advantage of year-round ease of access (the other route, of course, being severely limited by weather), and would be much more feasible in terms of construction

and maintenance. Finally, because of the existing projects that are in place on this route, there is much more knowledge of the area. Therefore, the chance that contractors and operators would be surprised by unpredictable conditions would be less than in the case of the other proposals. I would point out that the entire field of northern project construction is in its infancy and certainly there would be no question that on this route there would be greater knowledge, and less risk of unpredictable damage.

We are not suggesting that such a route does not have problems. We are suggesting that, in our view, it appears to have less problems than either the Foothills or the Canadian Arctic Gas proposals. Certainly, I would think a fundamental precondition of approval on such a route would be complete and thorough hearings in the local villages and communities along the route, of the type we are now witnessing under your chairmanship (rather than the kangaroo consultations staged by the petroleum companies). ^{and before the court} Another precondition would be the settlement of native land claims, the general approval of the residents and natives, and the general approval of the population of the Yukon. The Alyeska proposal is particularly attractive because it does not force on us a U.S. continental energy policy. Canada would be simply transporting U.S. energy resources to the U.S. market.

CONCLUSION

Let's face the reality that Canadians do not need, by any standard, this gas for many years. Certainly, all the reserves presently indicated in the Delta or the Beaufort Sea cannot justify a pipeline. I don't believe the Canadian people will stand for a project that threatens the future of the native people of the north, and the environment of our natural heritage. I believe we have a chance in Canada to display a new approach to the development of one of the last frontiers of the world. Our record as developers and exploiters of frontier land, up to this point, has been insensitive. We, as a country, have an opportunity to demonstrate to the world that we can develop our north in a civilized, humane and perhaps, a unique way. If I could paraphrase something that you yourself said, Mr. Commissioner, I believe the Canadian people agree that how we decide to treat our north will say a good deal to the world about the kind of people that we are. To simply continue hell-bent in a rush for spoils will do no credit to us, and perhaps cause future generations of Canadians to look on us in disdain. We now have an opportunity to demonstrate to our future generations that, as a country, we have changed, and we have matured, that we have learned some of the lessons of the past, and that we can now begin to live in harmony both with our environment, and with our native population.

